

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for April, 1968

ADAPTATION IN A NEW KEY	<i>Sister Teresa Margaret DC</i>
LIBERALISM AND THE FAMILY	<i>The Editor</i>
TROUBLE IN THE CHINESE COUNTRYSIDE	<i>L. Ladány, S.J.</i>
A SIGN TO CONVINCE	<i>Vincent Rochford</i>
THE JANUARY CUTS	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
THE DEATH AND DISASTER BOYS	<i>E. L. Way</i>

Contents

Page

193 LIBERALISM AND THE FAMILY
The Editor

195 ADAPTATION IN A NEW KEY
Sister Teresa Margaret DC

206 A SIGN TO CONVINCE
Vincent Rochford

210 CURRENT COMMENT
The Editor

221 THE DEATH AND DISASTER BOYS
E. L. Way

226 TROUBLE IN THE CHINESE
COUNTRYSIDE *L. Ladany, S.J.*

233 THE JANUARY CUTS
J. M. Jackson

241 ANY QUESTIONS ?
William Lawson, S.J.

247 IV. CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED
LITURGY *Observer*

254 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address:
If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furniva St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by Lithographic Universal Ltd. Bray.

Annual subscription: one year, twenty shillings; in the U.S.A., Canada and Australia, three dollars; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 20/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 9

APRIL, 1968

NUMBER 4

Liberalism and the Family

THE EDITOR

A LITTLE over two months ago, the *Guardian* ran a series of articles on the subject of "Marriage and Divorce". Amongst them was one on the family by Dr. Edmund Leach, Provost of King's College, Cambridge, who achieved notoriety with his Reith Lectures last year.

Dr. Leach began his *Guardian* article with a quotation: "The family is the fundamental unit of contemporary British society". He went on to comment, "Judging by the critical reaction to certain passages in the third of my recent Reith Lectures this dogma is very widely held to be a self-evident truth. But what is it supposed to mean?"

I thought I would try and tell him. My letter never appeared. Liberal editors appear very slow nowadays to give space to any views they consider illiberal; which means that upholders of principle have a thin time in the secular press. If there is one thing the permissive society is non-permissive about it is the right to a hearing of any non-permissive point of view. Under such circumstances the profession of liberalism tends to become something of a hypocritical farce.

The letter I wrote to the *Guardian* ran as follows:

"To speak of the family as 'the fundamental unit of contemporary British society' is somewhat ambiguous. One can have in mind what the family is meant to be in any

society at any time or what the family is in fact in the society of Britain at the present time. It is in the former sense that I would like to consider the family in answer to Dr. Leach's query at the outset of his article published in the *Guardian* on January 29th.

"The family is meant to be the foundation of human society. In this sense it is fundamental; basic to its life. Physically speaking, it is through the union in love, which marriage seals, that society is peopled with human beings. Post-Christians will object, perhaps, that there are other ways of accomplishing this than through the institution of marriage to found the family. Selective mating on an *ad hoc* basis, casual sexual liaisons, artificial insemination and other devices for breeding human beings may be cited against me. In reply, I would suggest that a human being is more than the sum-total of his physical parts and society more than a collection of physical beings. To be truly human, it must be permeated with human values and these are brought to it by its members. Society is no better and no worse than they are and they, in turn, are what their families make them. It is in this sense that the family is fundamental to society.

"Without discounting the significance of formal education or, indeed, of environment in this regard, I would say that the family is uniquely fitted to build up in its children those virtues or habits of good action through whose practice human values are set within society's life. What counts here is not so much formal learning as the upbringing given to children through the force of parental example and encouragement recognised as stable and set within the family round. It is clear that, in the whole of this process, the mother has a key role to play. I am convinced that she will only play it as she should within the security of stable marriage on the one hand and, on the other, a social order that allows her husband to assume the fullest responsibility possible for the welfare of his wife and children.

"The trend in this country at the moment is towards easier divorce and for public authority to supplant rather than supplement family function.

The birth and growth of African monasticism is a new creation. That is to say that in bringing the life of the Church into the life of Africa, there will be some modification both to Africa and the Church; for in adapting her cultural traditions to Christianity, Africa will experience a similar adaptation on the part of the Church to these "ethnic values" which the Church will assimilate. And this process will lead to mutual enrichment.

Adaptation in a New Key

SISTER TERESA MARGARET DC

"AS we witness the birth of African monasticism," writes Dom Jean Leclercq OSB, "we are aware that its life does not lie in the past but in the future, and that observing its growth will not mean looking back, but assisting in its creation." *

This birth and growth of modern monastic life in Africa is something that has happened within our lifetime, and is now ready to take the initiative, as it must do if it is to survive as an entity in itself, not a mere by-product or reminder of the colonial past. It has often been remarked by those with personal experience of their ceremonies, that Africans have a deep inner sympathy with the Eastern liturgies of the Church, due perhaps to the fact that monachism had its origins in that part of East Africa known as the Egyptian Desert, arising almost simultaneously in Syria and spreading rapidly through the Near Eastern countries and into the Roman province of Africa. Thus it

* From an address given at a congress held in Bouaké, Ivory Coast, West Africa, 1964. Sponsored by the *Aide à l'Implantation Monastique*, this was convoked for the purpose of studying the aims, approaches and methods of implanting monasticism in Africa, and one of the most outstanding contributions came from Dom Jean Leclercq, a Benedictine of Clervaux in Luxembourg and a counsellor at Vatican II. These pages lean heavily upon his articles and the reports of the Bouaké Conference, published in *Rythmes du Monde* and *Collectanea Cisterciensia*.

is from the "dark continent" that it first reached Spain, Gaul, Italy and finally Ireland and "Britannia", modern south-eastern England, passing from thence to Germany and central and eastern Europe contemporaneously with the expansion of Christendom itself. A similar expansion occurred in Ethiopia, where the monastic life has always existed and continues to do so today.

It may seem surprising that the Council document which lays the greatest stress upon the contemplative life is the Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church (*Ad Gentes*). The contemplative and monastic tradition in the context of the unresolved controversy over the two views (incarnational as distinct from transcendental) has often been vigorously contested; and many claim they can find no ultimate justification in it as a way of life. To them, the "new theology" with its "dynamic, evolutionary and incarnational view of man, the world and God" is either irreconcilable with, or else completely absorbs, the transcendental (or eschatological) view of the Christian life, in which the most fundamental principles of the monastic life are rooted.

Transcendental Values

To follow the threads of this involved argument would exceed the scope of the present subject, and it must suffice to observe that the eschatological note has never at any time been absent from the Church. As *Lumen Gentium* puts it: "The renovation of the world . . . is in a sense already anticipated in this world". As Christians we live in expectation of Christ's coming, having here no lasting city, looking forward to the "last times" (*to eschata*) as the early Christians did, with impatience. Nevertheless, the temptation to "flee the world" and seek a self-contained refuge has been with men from the beginning; as has also the urge to identify themselves entirely with human society, forgetting the essentially transcendental nature of their vocation and allowing some humanitarian preoccupation to pass itself off as the full living of their faith. The Christian vocation lies in neither of these extremes, since it is not a work of humanism but of divine love, wherein eschatology and incar-

nation are complementary values. Fr. Bernard Besret, Cistercian Prior of Boquen in France, expressed his regret at seeing "the beautiful Christian word 'incarnation' used as the label of a naively optimistic and ultimately naturalistic conception of the world, and equally to find the word 'eschatology', which should symbolize Christian hope and joy, used to designate a pessimistic attitude to the world at the present time, which it does not necessarily imply."

At the very time when the Council documents were in process of drafting, these fundamental positions were being debated; yet simultaneously those prelates who bear the responsibility for the Church's growth and activity in the mission lands — where every need, material and spiritual, is greatest — practically unanimously, upheld the absolute necessity of the contemplative life.

"Worthy of special mention are the various attempts at making the contemplative life take root. In making such an attempt, some, whilst retaining the essential elements of monasticism, strive to implant the rich traditions of their order, whereas others return to the simpler forms of ancient monasticism. *All, however, should strive after a genuine adaptation to local conditions.* For since the contemplative life belongs to the fullness of the Church's presence, it ought to be established everywhere in the infant churches. . . *Let them examine carefully how those ascetical and contemplative traditions (whose seeds God has at times deposited in ancient cultures even before the preaching of the Gospel) can be assimilated into the Christian religious life*" (*Ad Gentes* § 18. Italics mine).

These are crucial passages, since a bare transplantation of spiritual traditions or observances rooted in the ancient forms of Western monasticism is no longer acceptable. The problem of the relationship between the Church and non-Western culture remains primarily one of "adaptation", although this does not mean that the Church is wholly identified with Western culture, and needs only to be altered in a few non-essential details to become entirely acceptable to peoples of a completely different background and tradi-

tion. The real problem is one of reincarnation. If the Church is not to remain on the periphery of the non-Western world, it must be born anew into the history and culture of Asia and Africa, not as something alien, merely adapted or accommodated and grafted on to the indigenous culture.*

The Word of God is a seed that must germinate and grow in the soil from which it absorbs its life and sustenance, assimilating all its elements. This is clearly stated in the Council's Decree which lays down that the young Churches today must draw from their milieux and transform into themselves, the customs and traditions, arts and sciences of their peoples, and all those things which can contribute to the glory of God. Eighteen months before the promulgation of the Decree, the Benedictine Monastery at Bouaké was host to delegates from more than 35 African monasteries, Benedictines, Trappists and the Fraternity of the Virgin of the poor being represented.** This Congress issued a declaration in which the superiors of the African monasteries recorded their unanimous desire to present to the African a monachism "which fully accords with his own particular genius, and is at the same time, in harmony with the place of monasticism in the Church and with its traditional ideal . . . which has been lived on African soil from the very beginning, and is one of a humble and hidden life. The fundamental end of the monastic foundations of Africa "is to allow those African souls who feel they are drawn by the Spirit to

* This concept has been of necessity simplified here, for on the evidence of experts, it is fairly certain that no such thing exists as a recognizable, unified "African Culture" or philosophy, nor is there a common denominator in all African cultures which could be erected into a 'neo-African philosophy'. There is, however, a similarity in mental processes and distinctive ideas which Africans share among themselves as well as with other non-European peoples.

** The *Fraternite de la Vierge des Pauvres* is a new order, gaining tremendously in appeal among contemplatives in Africa who seek a simpler form of monastic life. It represents a radical break with the traditional monastic framework as it has developed in the West, being more akin to that of St. Anthony's hermits and the desert communities of St. Pachomius. Founded by a Belgian Benedictine in 1956, after a preparatory period in the Sahara with the followers of de Foucauld (*Petits Freres de Jesus*), it was first intended that these monks should literally dwell in tents, following the nomadic existence of the Bedouin, or the Israelites of the Exodus. However, this idea was abandoned in favour of working communities who rent small houses and earn their living as labourers on neighbouring farms. Their Rule lays great stress upon evangelical simplicity and poverty, which they feel to be more acceptable today than large monastic establishments associated with ecclesiastical power and extravagance.

realize this contemplative ideal in a state of life consecrated by the Church, and so to complete her establishment in their native country”.

Rites and Liturgical Symbols

In the context of liturgical renewal we have become familiar with the problems of rituals and symbolic actions in countries where European symbolism is meaningless if not distasteful, and the Constitution on the Liturgy requires experiments to be conducted as to how local customs and symbols can be incorporated into the heritage and worship of the Church. In Afro-Asian religious foundations the lessons have been slowly learned. Novices were taught that they must kneel up straight and join their hands together at prayer, but were often accustomed to a squatting position, and unable to “stand on their knees”; while their normal (and exceedingly prayerful) attitude was to fold the arms across the breast.

Our Western type of systematic “mental prayer” is little suited to the African contemplative, and freedom of interior movement and exterior expression should be allowed, since the purpose of meditation is to lead one into affective prayer, so that there is no need to labour over the means if the end is already achieved. A novice mistress in an African community reports that one day during Exposition three professed native sisters quite spontaneously began singing, and later one confided that the “type of prayer” laid down “was not designed for Africans” who wanted simpler forms of recitations, litanies and chants to suit the mood of the occasion. In short, a simplified form of life and of prayer is necessary for the African contemplative, one shorn of those psychological complications which have assumed so large a part of our Western heritage. If nourished by leisurely and reflective reading of scripture within the structure of the liturgy, with meditation in common alternating with periods of silence, the whole framework would complement and balance the parts.

Canon John V. Taylor, Anglican author of *The Primal Vision: Christian Presence Amid African Religion*, considers the non-African “indigenziers” tend to be superficial, and

that Africans know it. They legitimately doubt whether the European missionary who amuses himself dabbling in African art, music or dancing, has any conception of the profound differences between Western and African philosophers. That is why the "indigenizations" come more effectively from the African communities themselves, and it is here the role of monastic foundations can be vital. Many nuns of African congregations have requested the suppression of grilles and a relaxation of legislation concerning enclosure. Best of all, they seem to have taken the initiative in regard to some local customs and rituals. Leclercq quotes from an article by L. Algini which appeared in 1964 in an Italian publication *La Rocca*, reporting liturgical experiments being made by some Poor Clares in the Cameroons:

"With the Blessed Sacrament exposed, the sisters sing the Divine Office to the lively rhythms of local music and accompany their prayers with sacred dances of equal originality. With the exception of the prioress, the forty members of the community are all native vocations, and have invented this new way of praying, precisely in order to be able to praise and adore God with their whole being. In fact music and dancing are for the African the essential means of expression. How could those young women who wanted to consecrate their whole life to God in an enclosed convent, forget this simple fact? Their decision has led to a sharp increase in vocations. Many young women were hesitant about entering a contemplative convent, for they knew of the life only in its European form, and did not feel that this was in harmony with their own spiritual needs. But now that the contemplation has in some way become 'African' they brushed aside their doubts, and the number of applicants is growing daily."

Monastic Implantation

In the "response" to *Ad Gentes* (*The Documents of Vatican II*: Abbot-Gallagher), Eugene L. Smith points out that the Decree treats missions primarily as "foreign missions", and missionaries as evangelists "sent abroad". The Churches in Asia, Africa and Oceania "are treated fully

as Churches, rather than only as missions, and that treatment is a notable advance. However, their own missionary task in their own situation is quite inadequately emphasized . . . [it] seems to be left too much to foreign missionaries, and not made sufficiently the responsibility of local clergy and laity". Leclercq's address to the Bouaké delegates is of particular interest and importance. He pointed out that "implantation" which implies natural growth rather than a grafting process, was preferable to "adaptation" since if adaptation is in fact needed, it is hardly something that we from the West should bring about.

"What we must do is formulate a proper notion of tradition, one which will eliminate from our field of research everything that might stand in the way of what is new and original in African monasticism; for if it is to be faithful to the enduring values of monastic life, it must also be true to itself."

The kind of mutual adjustment he implied in the term "implantation" was "the insertion of a universal tradition into an ethnic or continental unity"; that is to say in bringing the life of the Church into the life of Africa, there will be some modification both to Africa and the Church; for in adapting her cultural traditions to Christianity, Africa will experience a similar adaptation on the part of the Church to these "ethnic values" which the Church will assimilate, and the process will thus mean a mutual enrichment. "It will consist in adopting, not necessarily all forms of African life, for there will be some that Africa herself will want to change, but certain profound characteristics of the African man, of his psychology, his soul." And this precisely is the task facing the African monastic enterprise today, since it can be said that the tradition of the Church there is not bound up with any specifically local historical traditions, nor is there any monastic history or tradition; Africa today from the monastic point of view is "somewhat like Ireland when St. Patrick arrived there and Germany with the coming of St. Boniface".

The many monasteries recently founded in Africa have no intention of importing the Western culture in which their members have been reared, or manning parishes with groups of two or three monks, but of establishing solid monastic communities which will in time become completely identified, spiritually and culturally, with the people among whom they live. The Church has been confined for virtually 1,500 years to Western Europe and the vehicle for Revelation has been a Western philosophy. During the nineteenth century when Europe made herself mistress of the world, other peoples were brought into contact with these thought-patterns for the first time. Christianity also spread, disseminated by missionaries who believed their culture to be basically Christian, and naturally assumed that it was part of the missionary task to broaden Western philosophy into a monolithic world philosophy. But, said Pope Paul, in an address to the Oriental Rite Bishops during his visit to the Holy Land:

“Each nation received the good seed of the apostolic teaching according to its own mentality and culture. Each local church grew with its own personality, its own customs, its own personal way of celebrating the same mysteries, without harming the unity of faith and the communion of all charity, and the respect for the order established by Christ. That is the origin of our diversity in unity, of our catholicity, always an essential property of the Church of Christ, of which the Holy Spirit has given us a new experience in our time and in the Council.”

In modern times, monastic foundations have been made in Africa by Westerners—Europeans and North Americans—whose observance and traditions have, over the centuries, acquired markedly Latin characteristics, as well as elements retained from the monastic middle ages, or “Benedictine centuries” in Europe. On the cultural, historical and geographical level, there is no perceptible link today between the early monachism of Eastern Africa and that now making its appearance in other regions of Africa from the West. Not only have the two traditions of monachism developed inde-

pendently of one another, but so also have the two "Africas"; and while the first traditions of the Egyptian desert were in harmony with the ancient civilizations, the reintroduction of monachism into modern "black" Africa has come from the later Western civilizations. However, one constant remains, and it is vital. As formulated at Bouaké:

"The quest for God as a community and in perfect charity, is a fundamental element of the Christian life which is particularly appreciated by the sociable temperament of the Malagasy. . . . Their innate sense of humanity, of mutual assistance and of hospitality, the absence of any type of complex, and their equanimity, are so many natural assets which bode well for the success of a monastic vocation. . . . 'To work for God': it is in this formula that the young African monk epitomizes the driving force in his vocation, the reason why he has come to lead a life of contemplation, rather than any other."

These natural assets are fundamental, being essentially the hallmark of the primitive monachism both of East and West. Certainly at the present time there are in Africa (still free as it is from the complexity and restlessness inherent in our Western technological society) many minds so simple and tranquil as to bear a striking resemblance to the monks both of antiquity and the middle ages, but to a large extent lost in the West where we have allowed our lives to be ruled by the autocratic summons of the clock. Our perpetual air of haste and "filling the unforgiving minute with sixty seconds' worth of distance run" is alien to the African as it was to the medieval monk whose day was regulated by the sun and broken only by regular hours of prayer. In *Un nègre à Paris* Bernard Dadié comments that "on every side he saw men, and it was always men-in-motion. It was as if someone were after them."

Return to Sources

One problem that had to be faced by some of the early foundations was that, for years to come, they could expect

few postulants qualified for clerical studies. Naturally the superiors decided to accept whatever candidates applied, despite any deficiencies in their education, rather than rely upon European reinforcements. Over and over again those candidates have proved to be of high spiritual calibre, giving outstanding evidence of the authenticity of their monastic vocations. Faced with this situation, the inevitable question arose: Why demand higher standards than were required of the first monks? Would not *ressourcement* in this case justify a return to Pachomius? Why attempt to transplant the Western tradition of several categories within the monastery to include choir monks and lay brothers? Was not the solution rather to admit and train all applicants for solemn profession without ordination? This was certainly in line with the monastic procedure at its beginnings and for many centuries; while even in the West there are monks querying the automatic assumption of the priesthood.* For African implantation it appears invidious and altogether unsuitable merely to introduce another Western custom and usage having nothing to do with genuine tradition at all.

The Bouaké Congress framed some basic presuppositions consequent upon this: e.g. that candidates gain a reading knowledge of the official language of the country, to enable them to take a fruitful part in the Office, and also to nourish their spiritual life by constant personal reading. "Such was St. Pachomius' method at Tebenna: the problem is by no means new." Accordingly the candidates were to be prepared for an understanding of the bible, since the whole spiritual life of the monk must draw strength from this source. The aim however is not a literary formation with a view to abstract speculation, but solid formation based upon scripture and liturgy.

Birth of a New Monasticism

African monachism today is not a replica of any other

* A British Cistercian abbey prefers to accept regular choir oblates than to maintain the status of lay brother; and in USA the same Order has limited the number of monks to be ordained, as they find those educated for the priesthood do not feel their ordination to be compatible with their monastic vocation

form, and that of tomorrow will be even less so. Far from being based merely upon a received tradition either from East or West, or the adaptation of a Rule framed primarily for a mentality and social culture which is alien, it will be based upon the authentic source of all monasticism, the Gospel, and drawn up for men who are Africans. The contemporary "Rule of Life" of the Fraternity of the Virgin of the Poor, which was consulted frequently by the delegates at Bouaké, contains a blending of the techings of St. Benedict and those of Père Charles de Foucauld who, as Hans Urs von Balthasar says, "began in the cloister and ended a hermit in the Sahara, striding backwards along the path the religious life had taken, to the primal source, to Anthony, and beyond him to the gospel . . . a childlike soul who plunged from the firm ground of the 'Institution' into the living, fruitful source [which is] pure gospel *caritas*, as yet undistinguished into love of God and love of neighbour."

Writing in *The Ampleforth Journal* two years ago, Fr. Aylward Shorter, a White Father, said that when leaders state they want to project an "African image", they are certainly not proclaiming a return to "the despised past . . . What they are doing is recognizing for the first time that, when the dead wood has been cut away, positive values and thought-patterns still remain which have little in common with the Western cultural tradition and which are capable of being developed . . . they want a Church of their own . . . Christian Africa will never be at home in the Church of God until she stops being . . . in a state of eternal juniority."

New life has sprouted from the old and venerable root of monasticism and of Benedictinism, one of its oldest branches, which proves again that the great orders are no more confined by the laws of historical time than the Church as a whole, but must always be open to new life, ready to take fresh directions. Like a beacon there shines forth from France, penetrating England, Italy and far beyond into the Afro-Asian world, a movement to re-establish a newer, more radical monasticism; of which Dom Jean Leclercq has become the theological and liturgical spokesman.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

Today we are not so keen to accept the old analysis of faith. Instead of proofs we look for signs. For God opens a door to faith and belief but does not thrust us through it and close it after us. And the greatest of signs is Our Lord himself. He had power. You can feel it as soon as you encounter him in the Gospels. And yet "all human records fail to offer such another example of love's victory over power".

A Sign to Convince

VINCENT ROCHFORD

THE believer is often enough asked to defend his beliefs, to state the evidence which convinces him of the reasonableness and even the duty in conscience to accept Jesus Christ as his Lord and Saviour. Indeed, in the age of religious controversy, not so long ago, he would do his best to prove that sheer reason had led him to the threshold of faith. For we had analysed the process by which a man comes to believe; there was a series of logical steps which could be considered one by one, the evidence for each weighed and critically evaluated, so that at the end a man must conclude that the inevitable step was to accept the Catholic Church.

He could think out for himself the mystery of the universe, the utter dependence of which pointed to an infinite super-personal Being. Once that step was taken the unique claims of Christ as God's spokesman and envoy had to be tested against the background of the Gospels, the eye-witness and ear-witness of his companions, and here the evidence of prophecy and of his miracles was vital to the case. Finally, it was clear that Christ established and committed his mission to a group of men hierarchically structured, giving a world-

wide charter and guaranteed the presence of his Spirit, who would lead them into all truth — even if the moment this should happen was implicitly brought well forward from the parousia.

His reason convinced by this train of reflection, then was the moment for his will to intervene and impel him to make his act of faith. Before that moment, everything was in the field of reason, and the believer naturally concentrated his apologetic effort on the three main problems which call, one after the other, for decisive conclusion, since the evidence was available to believer and unbeliever alike, and each had confidence in the ability of human reason to decide those questions.

“Proving” our Belief?

Today we would not accept the old analysis of the act of faith, we would not so confidently separate from each other the function of the intelligence and the will in predisposing us to believe. A better understanding of how the Gospels came to be written has been given us by modern scholarship. We should not quote prophecies in the same way, nor could we so confidently maintain that all Christ's extraordinary “works”, as St. John repeatedly calls them, were utterly beyond the powers of nature.

In fact, does God equip us to “prove” anything at all, in the sense of rational demonstration which should all but compel assent? It seems that God leaves much more room for man's freedom. He opens a door to belief, but does not thrust the creature through it and close it after him. Instead of proofs, he seems to leave us “signs” which point towards him, but which can be explained away.

In Old Testament times, for instance, events occurred that favoured the survival of Israel, others were defeats or disasters. Simultaneously those who were God's spokesmen proclaimed that these were God's doings; they revealed his presence amongst men, his activity amongst his people, his plan, his power, his wisdom, his love. For instance the escape of the Hebrews from their slave status in Egypt was

accompanied and facilitated by a whole series of events — the plagues, the recession of the Red Sea, the pillar of fire, the manna, water from the rock, which were explained as interventions by Yahweh to bring them into the desert into communion with himself through a Covenant. Looking back, no devout Israelite could doubt this, and they celebrated it every year at their Passover, and still do so. But it remains open to them to hold that these were nothing but fortuitous events owing their occurrence only to the working out of nature's laws.

And so throughout their history. That after fifty years of exile in Babylon a new monarch, Cyrus, succeeded to the throne who permitted the return of captive populations, thus making possible a second exodus and a spiritual reformation, was seen as God's work on their behalf: but this could be denied. Signs these were that would lead to faith: they did not compel it. God leaves men a broad area of freedom.

The Primary Sacrament

So, when Our Saviour came, his miracles were "signs" to use St. John's word. But they could be denied, without benefit of modern science; it could always be alleged that they were false, having been wrought on a Sabbath: or even by the power of the Devil. No matter, for surely the greatest "sign" of his mission is himself. He is the sacrament of God, witnessing to God's presence and making God present in his own Person.

Two very simple thoughts about him strike the reader of the gospels. The first is his extraordinary power, a quality perhaps the most dangerous of all to a human being. How many has it not corrupted throughout man's history. And if it does not corrupt, there is a great temptation to use it selfishly. A striking thing about Our Lord is his resolute refusal ever to profit from that power of his — whether it was a question of turning stones into bread, or that endemic temptation that must have come to haunt him at periods of his life, namely, to use his power so as to escape the road marked out for him that led to Calvary.

The least temptations of power are to grow insensitive to people's feelings and to grow apart from the common run of ordinary folk. One sees a docker accept an official position in his union, and eventually he has little idea of what the working docker, once his mate, is thinking. It is noticeable in the politician, who can so easily live in an artificial world of party advantage and be remote from the man in the street. It is to be found among churchmen equally.

Jesus never lost contact with the ordinary people, with the little things of life. He was most often with them, he read their unspoken thoughts, his lessons are made to hang on some detail of daily life—the flowers, the roasted sparrows on their skewer in the market, the children refusing to dance when it came to their turn, the hen blindly spreading her wings over her chicks to protect them, fishermen, farmers, artisans, servants — how close to them he remained, how he understood them! All human records fail to offer another such example of love's victory over power.

A second quality that strikes even the casual reader of the gospels is that Christ's moral virtue never removed him from the ordinary sinner, nor made the latter embarrassed in his company. Of his personal life he could challenge his accusers, "Which of you dares convict me of sin?" and receive no reply. In spite of their having a traitor amongst his most intimate group, who shared his life, his enemies could find no evidence to bring against him at his trial, when they most needed it to discredit him. Yet it was not a cold virtue that made sinners want to keep their distance. The roughest, the lowest: thieves, fences, characters of the underworld did not feel embarrassment when chance brought them to the same table as Jesus of Nazareth. For me, this is the greatest of possible "signs". Here alone is the Lord to whom we belong, who can save us from ourselves, and finally bring us to his Father.

CURRENT COMMENT

There are a whole number of topics on which much could be said this month. Only a few can be dealt with in the space provided. Father Crane has chosen to concentrate on student unrest here and abroad, Britain's present economy and the unpleasant logic of the recent Immigration Act. There are also comments on South Africa and the Olympics and the independence of Mauritius. There is a final note which draws a startling possible consequence from the New Hampshire Primary in the United States.

THE EDITOR

THE public image of Mr. Patrick Gordon-Walker has never been a happy one though, as Minister of Education, he has not irritated me personally to the same extent as Mr. Douglas Jay when President of the Board of Trade. One thought of this gentleman as so wedded to an outmoded belief in old-time planning that no human considerations could divert him from its purposes. Stanstead was a case in point. For Mr. Jay, it seems, the gentleman in Whitehall has always known best.

Nanny not Amused

The Minister of Education is dedicated to the same creed, but not in so ruthless a fashion as the former President of the Board of Trade. He reminds me very much of those kindly administrators I used to meet in Africa in the last of Britain's colonial days, good men who regarded "their" Africans as charmingly retarded adolescents, never as adults. About Mr. Gordon-Walker's attitude to university students at present there is a touch of the consul at sunset. Like the consul, he is hurt that those for whom Government has done so much should manifest such base ingratitude. He referred to the bumping they gave poor Mr. Healey's car at Cam-

bridge as "very severe". Nanny, one felt, was wagging a finger. If the kids don't behave, there'll be no more jam for tea.

The truth of the matter is that students at home are kicking against the colonial-type tutelage which post-war governments have placed over them. "How can they, after all we've done for them?", one heard this startled reaction to trouble from the "natives" in the old pre-independence Africa. It is interesting to get it now from Ministers at home; but, then, I have never known whether to be amazed or just cynically amused at the sight of post-war governments granting independence abroad in the name of freedom, whilst they steadily constrict it at home. Paternalism in the developing countries is out now and self-help in: paternalism is in, meanwhile, at home and self-help out. It is an interesting contrast and, for some, a disturbing one.

What Mr. Gordon-Walker cannot see, any more than the consul at sunset or, for that matter, other members of the present Government, is that material benefits — in this case, educational grants — are no substitute for a system whose trend increasingly is to take from citizens responsibility for their own lives. This, at base, is one main reason for present student unrest in this country. Students are against a system which makes them wards of the State during their university days, which turns them during this period of their lives into a "kept" segment of the citizenry, giving them a living on government's terms, not on their own. Resentment for the most part is subconscious and its expression muddle-headed; but it is deeply felt. Students, often without knowing it clearly, are against a system which touches their dignity on the raw because it denies them responsibility for their own existence at the most formative period of their lives. They find themselves kept by the State when they should be keeping themselves. Just when they want to get out of the nursery they find Nanny still in charge.

Nanny not Wanted

It will be pointed out that a great deal of student unrest in this country is tied up with the question of state grants;

that what students are after at present is an increase on what they receive already from Government. How, therefore, can it be said that they are against a system which, even now, they are trying to use to greater advantage for themselves? The answer, I think, is that they are not against it on the surface. As I have indicated already, student resentment is muddled and their basic frustration — at being denied full responsibility for their own lives — subconscious. But resentment and frustration are there and their basic cause witnessed to, I believe, by the present pressure of student bodies to share authority for the conduct of university affairs and make their voice heard on questions of national and international importance. If this means, as it appears increasingly to do, the disorder of violent protest, I would suggest that the violence is assisted by feelings of helplessness which come to those confronted with a political system they cannot influence and which is controlled by men who appear to have no understanding of a student generation far younger than themselves. Under such circumstances, the inclination is to smash things up; this is what is happening now. Mr. Gordon-Walker only makes things worse when he looks down his nose at those who behave in such fashion. So far as the students are concerned he represents Nanny, and they want no part of Nanny. This is what the poor man apparently cannot understand.

Discontent Representative

There is, of course, a great deal of fault on the student side. Most of them are deplorably lacking in good manners and revoltingly unkempt in appearance. A substantial number are incredibly gullible and, of these, some are allowing themselves to be taken in by radical and Trotskyist elements, who are cashing in on prevailing discontents. At bottom, however, they feel victims of a system which deprives them of substantial responsibility for their own lives, which they can in no way influence and which is run by men almost completely out of touch with themselves. In this sense, present student protest in Britain expresses a mood of disenchantment prevalent in the country at large. It is not

merely that the policies of this Government are desperately old-hat. The truth is that the men who make the policies appear to have no concept that they are. One has the feeling of being governed by a clutch of Fabians still talking the language used by G. D. H. Cole in his Oxford days. They are prisoners of their past, almost totally unable to realise that their ideas are out. What they cannot understand is that they now appear before the public as figures of fun. No one is prepared to take them seriously. They are no longer credible.

Parallel with Eastern Europe

There is a parallel here between student unrest in Britain and that which is in full blast, as I write these lines, in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Premier Gomulka and President Novotny are protagonists of a system which is not merely oppressive, but out of date. This, I think, is the real point. Those in charge in Poland and Czechoslovakia and, indeed, in Russia itself, are not merely menacing, they are figures of fun. Everything about them is ridiculous, especially to the young whose craving, above all else, is for life within a system which allows them to realise the whole of their energy in fulfilment of themselves. This is what the old leaders of Eastern Europe cannot see. This is what they never will see. They stand there baffled, uttering out-worn platitudes like so many tired old clowns; seeking still to play at Nanny, when the one thing necessary is for them to take the wraps off their ailing system and allow the pent-up energy of years to be released. It will have to happen in the end. There need be no fear about that. The question now is not "whether", but "when" and "how". Sooner, in all probability, than most people think.

Africans and Olympics

The African outcry against South African participation in the forthcoming Olympics is understandable, but unwise. Quite apart from the fact that sport should not be tied to politics, there is the gain represented in that South Africa made marked concessions as the price of participation in the

Olympic Games. She undertook that her team should be multiracial, that its members would travel as one completely integrated party, wear the same uniform and march as one unit behind the South African flag. Moreover, the South African selection committee would be multiracial, half white and half black.

These were considerable concessions freely made. Who knows, but that others would have followed in other spheres. Already, some have been made. Diplomatic representatives of independent African States are not discriminated against in the Republic. At the same time, booming industry there is drawing black labour into semi-skilled jobs still supposed to be reserved by law for Whites. But trade and industry know no frontiers. South African capital is finding its way North. Rothmann's cigarette factory in Nairobi bears witness to this fact. So, too, does the increase in Zambian trade with South Africa since the Rhodesians made their unilateral declaration of independence in November, 1965.

One can hate *apartheid*, whilst realizing at the same time that violence and protest are not necessarily the best ways of eradicating it. It would have been far better had the African States seen as a hopeful beginning South Africa's acceptance of multiracial arrangements as the price of her participation in the Olympics. Instead of congratulating South Africa on the good she has done, African States have chosen to ostracize her for that which she has not yet accomplished. Their gaze is short-term rather than long, yet it is only over the long run that South Africa will rid herself of abuses which men of good-will rightly regard as repugnant to Christian practice.

Soviet Hypocrisy

The Soviet Union's support of the African States in this matter is not merely ludicrous, but hypocritical to a degree. Sir Arnold Lunn was right to point out in a letter to the *Sunday Times* on March 10th that the Soviet Union herself was practising *apartheid* against Jews resident in her territory:

"*Apartheid*", he wrote, "is not a monopoly of South Africa. The *Times* of February 8, 1967, published a

letter signed by 252 Members of Parliament which expressed grave concern about the difficulties confronting Jews in Russia, and called on the British Government to use its good offices to secure for Jews the same basic human rights enjoyed by other Soviet citizens. Are those who are so anxious to exclude South Africa from the Olympic Games equally anxious to exclude Russia?"

The question is a fair one. One might add that this country after the recent Immigration Act is hardly in a position to talk of *apartheid*. Whichever way you look at it, the Act denies the normal rights of citizenship to a certain class of this country's citizens solely on account of their colour. Its Asian citizens, at present in East Africa, have been accorded a special sub-citizen status. This has been done in defiance of previous pledges implicit in undertakings made when East African countries were given independence. A further effect is to render hypocritical this country's refusal to sell to South Africa arms designed for her external defence.

The Logic of Self-Centredness

The Immigration Act should not be taken in isolation. It is best understood as the latest in a line. Self-centredness contains its own unpleasant logic and the Act is best understood as the logical consequence of a self-seeking attitude which has governed this country since the end of the last war. The surrender of Empire — irrespective of whether it was due or not at the time — was motivated as much by selfishness as magnanimity; and it is motive that interests me here. Behind the transfer of power lay the desire of the British to be done with burdens abroad. The aim was not so much to bring peoples to nationhood as to build at home the English equivalent of that Scandinavian paradise which had always been dear to Socialist hearts. This explains, as much as anything I know, the rush to be done with responsibilities overseas and the half-heartedness of post-colonial policies. It was not merely a matter of throwing the kids in at the deep end of the pool. One began to wonder whether anyone cared if they drowned.

Throughout the whole of the post-war period, the politicians have confronted the British people with a false dichotomy. They have been told that they could not carry the burden of enlightened Commonwealth and post-colonial policies abroad and, *at the same time*, build up their own standard of living at home. It had to be one or the other; continued acceptance of commitments abroad and lowered standards at home or better living at home and the shedding of the overseas load. It was never realised that the dichotomy was false; that there was, in fact, a third way; that the sense of responsibility which would release energy in generous service overseas was also essential to stimulate post-war recovery and maintain the driving force of a healthy economy at home; that, for our people especially, you could not have one without the other. This is what we did not see and so we turned in on ourselves, transferring to a search for security at home the self-centredness which caused us, at the same time, to abandon commitments abroad. The surrender of national responsibilities abroad has been followed by the surrender of individual responsibilities at home, where government has been made responsible for the welfare and security of each of its citizens. We have sought salvation in the guided democracy of the Nanny-State. In the process individual initiative has been stifled and energy crippled. The result has been an economy that staggers because worked half-heartedly by a frustrated people. Having abandoned commitments overseas, we are still without the coziness we sought through foolish concentration only on ourselves. Yet, we still look to government to work the miracle, which can only come about through a release of individual energy that will only come, in its turn, when government cuts down enormously on the present extent of its control over this country's economic life.

White Man's Burden

Until we reach this point and for as long as the present mood lasts, we will continue to seek release from present troubles in government manipulation at home and the abandonment of remaining commitments overseas. It was

inevitable, therefore, that we should withdraw from Singapore and the Gulf long before time and against the wishes of their inhabitants. It was inevitable also that, rather than share with strangers the replica of a Scandinavian paradise we are trying so painfully and so foolishly to build for ourselves, we should exclude from this country those who seemed to threaten its standard of living. Hence, the new Immigration Act. What right had a load of Asians to share our bread? The call is a far one from talk of "the white man's burden" that marked Victorian days. Yet the burden exists; only the form has altered. Its substance is still there.

It was inevitable, also, that not long ago we should threaten the Maltese with economic disaster in an endeavour to secure a fractional lightening of our own load. It was inevitable, too, that we should shove Mauritius off into independence on March 12th in an atmosphere of threatened communal strife and against a long-term prospect of near starvation.

Back to the Students

To return for a moment to the students. As already indicated, their present unrest is produced, at base, by the frustration they feel at their "kept" proletarian status. There is in addition amongst them mounting dissatisfaction with the exclusively material goals of post-war government and with the system of guided centralism, which their elders tell them is essential to their pursuit. In their own way, students query the material exclusiveness of government goals, yet find themselves totally unable to alter them because of the remote impersonality of the centralized machinery set up by the politicians to obtain them. In fact, they are finding that nothing they can do as persons can alter a system which is, of its nature, impersonal. Nothing, that is, except protest. A query raised by C. S. Lewis is apposite in this context and Christopher Derrick did well to cite it in a recent letter to the *Times*. The query is "whether the great evil of our civil life is not the fact that there seems now no medium between hopeless submission and full-time revolution". This country's students are faced now with this dilemma. Sub-

mission, for them, is out and so they take to the streets in much the same way that the Poles and Czechs and the young writers in Russia today are taking to the streets, crying out for liberty as they do so. This is the thread that binds all these movements together at the moment; outcry against the untouchability of centralized planning systems which allow out-of-touch oldsters arrogantly to assume control of citizens' lives. In this sense, students today are representative of many more than themselves, who are ahead of all Parties in this country in their growing realization that it is the part of government to supplement individual initiative, never to supplant it.

Mr. Heath and the Scots

Mr. Heath and his colleagues in the Conservative Party need to realize this, if they are to bring any substantial change in this country's fortunes when they return to power. If they are wise, they will see the present drive behind Scots' Nationalism as springing essentially from the simple determination of a sane and healthy people to take control of their own lives. This, after all, is what dignity demands of any man. There is no reason why it should be a prerogative of the Scots or the Welsh. It belongs to us all and Englishmen, as well as Welsh and Scots, should insist on it as the simple right of every member of the United Kingdom, irrespective of his origins. In other words, the thing we must work for at the moment is devolution, the removal of government from its present position of preponderance over individual lives, in order that there may follow that release of energy amongst citizens which West Germany's former Chancellor Erhard, the architect of her remarkable economic come-back after the war, sees as essential to Britain's recovery.

Senator Kennedy and New Hampshire

Undoubtedly, the New Hampshire primary will have come as a jolt to the Johnson Administration in the United States. It means, in all probability, that Senator Robert Kennedy will decide to offer himself as a Democratic presidential candidate. If he does so and displaces President Johnson,

then goes on to win the Presidency for his Party, his first task will have to be the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. Brutally put, this means that the Americans will have to concede victory to the Vietcong. Ho-Chi-minh will have won his war and the United States will stand revealed as the paper tiger Mao-Tse-tung has always held her to be. Under the circumstances, the nations of South-East Asia will hasten to make accommodations with Communist China. The Soviet Union will take account of her growing strength. Present quarrels will be mended between the two giants and guerilla onslaughts stepped up in intensity throughout the developing world. Given Communist China's fast-growing nuclear strength, it is not inconceivable that, by 1971, we shall witness a second partition of the world between two massive Communist Powers on the one hand and, on the other, an America withdrawn into isolation, seeking to find within her own borders some sort of refuge from the bitter humiliation of military defeat. The first partition of the world at Yalta gave Soviet Russia Eastern Europe. The second may give the whole of Asia, including India, to China and the Soviet Union. From there, the spring-off to Africa, Australia and South America is only too obvious.

How we can be so dumb as not to see this possibility I do not know. But it is always like this with Communism. No-one believes it can "happen here". When it does, it is too late. The least men of good will can do between times is to clear their own minds. The very fact that they attempt to do so could prove sufficient to reverse the present tide.

The press apart from being a factory for the manufacture of political legends and lies devotes far too much of its space in reporting vice, and misery and crime. We who finance them by buying the papers are as much to blame as the newspaper proprietors. We largely get the press we deserve. If we only bought the weeklies and the monthly periodicals we would rapidly bring the owners to heel.

The Death and Disaster Boys

E. L. WAY

ANEURAN BEVAN in a moment of exasperation called the British Press the most prostituted press in the world. Some people were surprised; others thought it a bit strong. It is true that he had been subjected to a campaign of vilification. A journalist had gone so far as to set up a telephoto lens the better to spy on him in the privacy of his home. Bevan had reason to be angry. But to call our press the most prostituted in the world seemed to me at the time to be going a bit far. I have since changed my mind. The press frequently distorts the truth for money. It exists to make money, and to propagate views which safeguard the interests of money. The present British economic crisis, and the way it has been exaggerated, is a good example of the way it works, and the purpose for which it exists. And once it creates a legend that legends develops a life of its own. It grows apace and on its foundation other legends, and indeed whole philosophies, are built. As a result a nation plunges into a mood of frustration and gloom; that is if it is not set like a pack of hunting dogs on a politician to tear him in pieces. Thus in recent months the press has tried to destroy George Brown because he had the guts to attack Roy Thompson in public. George said that the press was doing this country a disservice by giving so much publicity to the

activities of Philby. Being George Brown he added a characteristic touch or two to his statement. The press failed to dislodge him so it turned on Wilson and, at the moment of writing, is doing its best to destroy him. How long will it be before it starts on Roy Jenkins? People who know about these things realise that any radical government anywhere is bound to be attacked by the papers owned by rich men. Roosevelt and his New Deal was subjected to the same treatment. Kennedy had the whole of the Press and TV against his moderate proposals for a medicare bill. The doctors, a very rich body of men in America, bought up as much of the advertising time available to abuse his very moderate measures, to help the retired sick, as Red Medicine. We know the folk lore attached to that.

Legend or Lie?

But let me give an example of the manufacture of legends. One has not been able to pick up a paper for months without sooner or later coming upon a reference to our balance-of-trade deficits. They, indeed, are facts, and not the product of the Fleet Street legend factory. The legend factory has gone to work on them and turned them into a most depressing and grim fairy tale. As a nation, so the fairy tale goes, we cannot *now* pay our way. We go round the world with a begging bowl asking the bankers to give us loans. We have become shameless. We have been weakened by the hand-outs of the Welfare state. And the world is weary of our woe. There's no need to dot the i's and cross the t's of this argument. We know it as well as we know the story of the three bears. And I'm not denying that there may be some truth in it. All I'm denying is that balance-of-trade deficits prove the truth of any of it. The fact is that Britain has had trade gaps for most of her history as an industrial nation. The number of years in which we sold enough goods to pay for our exports can be counted on the fingers of two hands. Those years were 1797, 1802, 1816, 1821, 1822, 1956 and 1958. If the balance-of-trade deficits prove our weakness, our inefficiency, and the laziness of our work people, they

must prove also that in 1805 and 1815, the years of Trafalgar and of Waterloo, we were already weak, inefficient, and lazy; and even then only too ready to trot out the begging bowl. The fairy tale just will not stand up to any kind of examination. But the Fleet Street legend factory is so powerful and persuasive that even highly intelligent men and women believe the nonsense it turns out day after day. At the moment its paymasters are gunning for the Labour Government, and the electorate is so shattered under the bombardment that a comedian short of material has only to mention the name of Harold Wilson to bring the house down. We are rapidly becoming a nation of political Alf Garnetts: ignorant, stupid, and vicious in our attacks upon nearly every member of the present government. That the breath tests have lowered the murder on the roads by 13 per cent has scarcely received the attention it deserves, because of the intensity of the anti-labour propaganda.

Disadvantages of the Lie

That the gap in our trade is a threat to our way of life is true. And we shall be forced to adapt our exports, and our trading methods, to this fact. But we shall not be encouraged to do this by fostering the growth of lies. And one of the chief lies of our time is that trade deficits point to a deterioration of the British character. What they point to is a loss of our wealth, the loss of our overseas investments. But as I pointed out in an article in the last issue even this fact is disputed by some. But, of course, the object of the lie is the determination of the rich to dismantle the welfare state. What they want is to cut social benefits: to do away with free school meals, to increase the cost of medical and dental treatment, to cut the hospital and school building programme; and some of them would like to put an end to family allowances, and reduce wages if they could. Just consider the case of the man who earns £14 a week (and has name is legion), with three children, who has to pay 7/6 on Monday for his children's school meals, and on top of this has to pay for his fares, his gas and electric bills, and his rents and his rates. Will he not have to perform miracles

of budgeting to make ends meet? The business community may want to make his task impossible by reducing his standards even lower. Can any humane person want this? But this is what we shall get where men are not protected by powerful unions.

Death and Disaster

There is another aspect to the problem the press poses, and that is suggested in the title of this article. The press thrives on death and disaster. It grows rich on it because it caters for something low in human nature. The day the newspaper is full of stories telling us of husbands who do not murder their wives, and of wives who do not commit adultery, but rather of loyal and loving wives and husbands; the day we are told that millions of bridges all over the world are not collapsing in hurricanes, that countless millions have spent a peaceful night, on that day we shall wearily throw down the paper and say "There is nothing in the paper today". Unfortunately none of our preachers ever seem to denounce this passionate longing to read about the disasters of other people. It surely is a strange way of loving our neighbour. *And it gives a totally distorted picture of human life.* The gospel of bad news has replaced the gospel of good news. We want to see more and more pictures of burning villages in Vietnam. We are crazy to get a glimpse of fleeing women, clutching their children, while the whistle and crack of rifle bullets shatters their peace and terrifies them. And we adore having a ringside view of it all. If we didn't the newspapers would go out of business. Of course, the death and disaster boys have an answer. That is something they are never short of. Like the weathermen they say they don't bring down the rain, and the disastrous floods. They only report them. And why do they report only bad news? Because we like it, they say. And by pandering to our evil tastes they encourage them, and make us long for more.

Shakespeare and all That

And are not Shakespeare and Homer, and the rest of the great writers full of nameless horrors? Perhaps they are,

but their evil news has passed through the crucible of a mind. And the death and disaster boys have been robbed by their employers of their minds. They have to rip away the veils of privacy and shame; they are paid to bay after and hunt down the unfortunate, the miserable and the vile. And all for our delight. *The medium of newsmongering has indeed become the message: and the message is that men are murderers, twisters, adulterers, and maniacs.* When will we call a halt to this criminal folly? When will we release the death and disaster boys from their vocation of wallowing in filth and misery.

Increasing the Evil

Do we not see that the glare of publicity when turned on certain evils only tends to magnify them? Say, for example, a hundred teenagers became drug addicts five or six years ago. If they had been medically treated in the secrecy of surgeries or mental homes and had not captured the headlines would their numbers have increased to the present proportions? Furthermore if certain of these cases, which included what are called 'pop stars', had been ignored by the press would not this abstention have done something in stopping the descent into hell by hundreds of deluded youngsters?

In cases where criminal neglect has caused serious losses of life and property the death and disaster boys serve a most useful purpose in exposing the criminal neglect. The coaltip that slipped down the mountain and destroyed a generation in Abervan, and the fishing trawlers that have been sunk in seas with waves more than 50 feet high — these surely should be fully reported, so that if it is possible such disasters should be prevented. But there should be full reportage. One should not be kept from the facts to protect officials or owners. But apart from death and disaster caused by neglect, one would like to put in a plea for more news of human kindness and decency. There is so much of it about and yet it never gets into the news.

MONTHLY REPORT

The communist take-over of China was followed immediately by a ruthless breaking-up of the ancient system of landholding. The peasants were to be the new men of the Communist State, proudly producing their crops for the collectivity. It has been very difficult to achieve this result, and the Communist Party may be further away from it now than at any time in the past fifteen years. Mao's "cultural revolution" seems to have played into the hands of those who had no great love for collectivization. We are grateful to our Australian contemporaries, *Social Survey*, for permission to reprint this article.

Trouble in the Chinese Countryside

L. LADANY, S.J.

THE cultural revolution has disturbed the whole fabric of life in Communist China, not least in the countryside. The result has been a strengthening of peasant efforts to return to older ways.

The first post-revolution years saw the communist collectivization of China's land proceed at a great rate. The stages are well known: division of land, land-reform up to 1952; collective farms (Production Co-operatives) in 1955; communes in 1958. Soon after this, however, in 1960, the system began to slip into reverse, and the right use of land, livestock and implements was given back to the "production brigade" — in reality, to the small, natural village. In 1961, the village became the "accounting unit", and disposed of land and manpower. Under this system, peasants had a

private plot, "self-retained land", which meant that the regime was only a hairline distance from handing the land back to the peasants. The villagers, however, were not left to themselves; above them were the great brigade, commune, district, county, province, special district and Peking — a hierarchic gradation of Party secretaries who had all the real power.

Purged Officials

The cultural revolution broke this up. In fact it swept away the Party machinery and produced a multitude of unwanted troublemakers. After being ousted from Party positions because they had "taken the capitalist road", large numbers of former officials went from provincial capitals to the countryside, and major disturbances began. Masses of peasants entered the cities to fight against the new orders. But the new peasant restiveness is manifested not only in violent actions. At home in the villages they have become masters of the situation. Instances are quoted of their producing old land deeds, claiming land and houses that belonged to their families before the land-reform.

The majority probably did not do this; but they took an even more practical step — they refused to hand their grain to the State. Collectivization, to all practical purposes, no longer existed. Local Party cadres and the militia were on the side of the peasants, and newly installed village leaders dared not interfere. The military had to be sent to the villages to take charge and to direct the village militia. The Chinese press reports this in a very indirect way. It says only that the military lead the criticism of Lieu Shao-ch'i, the former chief of State, criticism of what he allegedly said six years ago, that the land should be given to the peasants—Peking could not very well say that collectivization of land in China now exists only in name. The military, in fact, are having a hard time; and for the moment their main task is to see that the peasants deliver up the grain.

Violence

In some provinces, the restiveness of the peasants took a

violent form. Crowds of peasants swarmed into the cities, not to seek employment, but to fight, to fight the pro-Mao-Lin Party, to fight workers and fight the "revolutionary small generals", the red guards. On September 1, 1967, the Revolutionary Committee of Peking city condemned "peasants entering the city to fight". This condemnation was broadcast in the provinces also; it dealt with a nationwide problem. Provincial news states that the peasants are being incited and sent to the cities by the uprooted former provincial and local Party cadres hiding now in the countryside.

Explanation

Ch'en Yung-k'ang explained. (He was the model rice producer of 1953 in Kiangsu, who has been celebrated ever since. He became a member of the National People's Congress and read a paper at the scientific symposium in 1964 in Peking). Last August, he wrote a letter to village cadres and poor and lower middle peasants of Kiangsu province (not published in the Peking press). He wrote it immediately after the explosive events at Wuhan and said: At present wicked men in Party and Army are fighting a bitter struggle and are engaged in a counter-attack encouraged by the "examination" of Liu Shao-ch'i, "the Chinese Khrushchev", which was a declaration of war.⁽¹⁾

These wicked men hiding in the Party and in the Army recently — at Wuhan — surrounded and attacked comrade Hsieh Fu-chih and Wang Li.

Harvests

Last year's autumn harvest and this year's summer harvest were abundant, and, in the greater part of the country, this year's autumn harvest is promising; but the enemy is fighting to prevent the grain from being properly used. These men, men from the Party and from the militia, go to the villages,

(1) "Examination" is the name now given to the second confession of Liu Shao-ch'i, a mysterious affair that has been several times referred to in the national press. This "examination" was not published except on a wall poster, according to which it was a mild self-accusation. Liu said that he had misjudged the political situation.

incite the gullible masses and send the peasants to the cities to surround and fight the proletarian revolutionaries.

"In some regions they practice counter-revolutionary economism and give supplementary labour-points, money and grain, to commune members to take part in fighting . . . all to incite the peasants to enter the cities to fight the revolutionary mass organizations in factories, mines, administration bureaus and schools."

"Commune members" who went to the cities to engage in physical fights must return to the villages.

The explanation, therefore, is that the peasants were paid or bribed. The implication is that members of the ousted Party apparatus are ruling the countryside and have material resources at their disposal.

A Provincial Regulation

On July 8, 1967, 1,000 "poor and lower middle peasants" were at a meeting organized by the military in Hangchow, the capital of Chekiang province. A Ten-Point Proposition was produced. Point 3 said: Destructive activities of the enemy must be stopped. The inciting of gullible peasants, now at the time of summer harvest and summer sowing, is still going on; people leave their production places, enter the cities to surround and attack the revolutionary parties, destroy industrial and agricultural production, and wreck the cultural revolution. We poor and lower middle peasants are going to oppose their machinations. We shall teach the peasants to remain in their working posts.

Point 5 said that many village cadres are "good or passable", but many others are "passive or sabotage the work", and go so far as to take revenge on revolutionaries who criticize them.

Point 7: People should be taught to use food sparingly even when there is a good harvest.

Point 8 repeated that peasants who left the fields and went to the cities must return, and educated youths who went from the villages to cities and towns must go back.

Point 9 said that the peasants should welcome the military who go to the villages, and Point 10 that the local militia

should not relax the surveillance of *ti-fu-fan-huai-yu* ⁽²⁾, these people should remain quiet and should not dare to budge. If they start revenge and destruction they must be treated firmly by means of the proletarian dictatorship.

Sabotage

A curious story was broadcast in Anhui. A company of artillery went on a truck to a village to help in the harvest and help in class struggle. They found that many peasants were absent. Some had gone to the towns, many had gone fishing. The soldiers went into the houses to investigate what had happened, why these men had left, especially at the time of the harvest. They found that those who went fishing were from the poorer (poor and lower middle) families who lived under economic stress. They were told that they could get money for the fish and would fare much better than by working in the production team. That it was harvest time did not matter. The company of soldiers called the local militia to account and taught them the Thoughts of Mao, "to see in this mirror their own wicked face".

The walkout of youth, probably not only those sent there from the cities, was reported in several provinces. In April, last year, the military in Kiangsu issued an order calling on the educated youth to return to work. In July, the military held a telephone conference in the province of Chekiang. Its theme was that the educated youth who had gone to cities and towns must return to the villages. Wicked men had incited the village youth to quit and go to the cities. In their absence work in the field suffers. The *People's Daily* (July 14) published a story about ten young men in a production brigade in Heilungkiang who resisted the temptation and stayed on.

(2) The *ti-fu-fan-huai-yu*, an abstract term and abbreviation for "landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and rightists" may mean the enemy in general. But the term more specifically means those under forced labour. Chou En-lai said on March 19 at a meeting of farmers from the neighbourhood of Peking: "The *ti-fu-fan-huai-yu* must remain under your surveillance and should not be allowed to budge". The Resolution of the same meeting said: The central authorities' regulation concerning public security emphasises that in the villages the *ti-fu-fan-huai-yu* are the subjects of dictatorship. They must stay under corrective labour, under the surveillance of poor and lower middle peasants and they are not allowed to budge. *People's Daily* (March 21, pp. 1 and 2) These are the classical terms in the *People's Republic for forced labour*.

Land Deeds

Concerning old land deeds, the *Peope's Daily* (July 27, 1967) had another incidental revelation. In a village — it did not say where — “the *ti-fu-fan-huai-yu* seized the occasion and broke out. They were very active. They inspected houses and lands *in order to restore the order that existed before*. A ‘landlord element’ went so far as to demand the house which before the land reform (before 1952) had belonged to him and asked the old peasant who lived there to repair it. This scoundrel, who has been hiding for 20 years, was caught by the proletarian great culture revolution”.

That people should remember exactly the land and house that belonged to their family twenty years ago is quite astonishing. One may well assume that much of the fighting in the countryside of which radio broadcasts speak is a settling of old accounts.

Battle for Grain

The big battle of the peasantry is for land and grain. Village officials dare not resist them. Many are on their side, hand over grain and give high labour points. Labour points are the traditional way of remuneration.

An editorial of the *Chekiang Daily* (August 3) said that proletarian politics and not labour points should be in command. Socialist activities among the peasants should be brought into action, and the summer harvest and summer sowing should be done. The “Chinese Khrushchev” was very wrong when he wanted to get peasants to work by offering material incentives. He led astray both peasants and village cadres. This will be corrected by the cultural revolution and by the great debate and great struggle. Where peasants work for the sake of labour points, they neglect politics. Then evil trends arise. People think only of their own interest and not of the interests of the State and of the collective. They till the land to get labour points, and not because of the revolution, and they do not do the work well; they do not care how the work is done. The result is deplorable. Even now there are some who say that labour points are important incentives, but this is wrong. It is politics, it

is the Thoughts of Mao that must be in command. The directive of comrade Lin Piao is that the busier the people are, the more politics should be injected into their lives and work.

After this disconcerting proposition, the editorial added: "When we criticise labour points being put in command, we do not mean that proper remuneration of labour is to be diminished or suppressed. We still carry out the principle, 'distribution according to labour'. Therefore it would be wrong to stop recording labour points". If this makes sense, it means that the old system should stand, but private plots, private occupations and a better livelihood for the peasants must go. The recalcitrants must be punished. As everywhere else, in this province also, many village cadres refused to take responsibility, and waves of violent resistance swept through the villages.

"Do Little, Care Little"

Another editorial of the same *Chekiang Daily* (July 19) complained that even those village officials who had joined the new ranks were not interested in the "great debate", in the great proletarian this or that; they only do the work; and even in that, they work on the principle that "It is better to do little than to do much, to care little than to care much". "They are angry because the peasants will resent their interference . . . They are afraid to make mistakes and they do not want to work; when they see something wrong they say nothing."

It was reported from Kansu province that the cadres in charge give out high labour points and premiums and distribute much more grain to the peasants than they should. They do this, as they say, to encourage the masses to work. When the official propagators of the Thoughts of Mao arrived at a commune, they went to the 19 production brigades to investigate, and found abuses everywhere. The leaders of the commune, great brigades and brigades held a meeting and the heads of the militia battalion, companies and platoons, representatives of the poor and lower middle peasants, of women, and of revolutionary organizations were

present. It was decided that propaganda with wall posters, leaflets and big slogans would accuse the "Chinese Khrushchev"; the local cadres were to be criticised for their insistence on material incentives and their negligence in work. There would be no more high labour points and no working tasks would be assigned to the individual families: enemies would be fought against.

Conclusion

Can one form a composite picture from these fragmentary data? One might say that the peasants, in the disorder of the cultural revolution, have emancipated themselves. The restive, especially the young, have abandoned poorly-paid work in the fields. They have thrown themselves into the turmoil of the (cultural) revolution. Possibly many went into the cities because living standards in the cities are higher.

The bulk of the peasantry remains in the villages, but lives better than before, and cares little for State and collective, even if externally the forms and names of commune, great brigade and brigade, are maintained. Village Party cadres, now that the Party organizations are no more, did not interfere, nor did the local militia. The provincial Party leaders, now active in the countryside, probably promise the peasants a good life. They have an easy success against Peking when Peking says loudly that land, grain, and money must be taken away, and that the grain eaten by the peasants must be accounted for. The army is supposed to impose the will of Peking and ensure that the grain goes to the State. In how many places, in how many provinces this is done effectively, no one knows. And there is a question never mentioned: where does the grain go in provinces where the military is not firmly behind Peking? Not all State granaries are in Peking. Most of them are in the provinces.

THE INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

The cuts in the social services are no more than devices to get more money out of the taxpayer's pocket and so reduce consumption. The prescription charges are seen by some as an attack on the fundamental principle of a free health service. Dr. Jackson compares a free health service with an insurance scheme, and argues that it is quite wrong to introduce fresh charges into the system "until such time as we are in a position to think about dismantling it (the health service) altogether".

The January Cuts

J. M. JACKSON

THE pattern of events following the announcement of devaluation in November has followed the pattern set in 1964 when the Labour Government came to power. Then it announced an import surcharge to meet the balance of payments crisis and only some time later the deflationary measures that were needed to re-inforce the import controls. Now we have had devaluation in November, cuts in January and a tough budget in March. (Although written at the end of January, it seems safe enough to take the Chancellor at his word and to assume that a budget as he has threatened will appear before this article is in print.) I tried to make it clear in my January article that in the past we have tried to cure the balance of payments by deflation. If more people are out of work, if total incomes are reduced, our imports will fall as a result of reduced spending; and if exports do not change, the balance of payments will improve. If, on the other hand, we increase our exports, the balance of payments is also improved. This we hope will happen as a result of devaluation, but once exports do begin to rise there will quickly come a time when inflation becomes a serious

problem. If men and resources are used to produce goods for exports, they cannot also produce goods for our home consumption. We must therefore make sure that goods are made available for export, and are not drawn by pressure of demand into home consumption.

Why the Delay

This would have been obvious to any first year student of economics in November, when devaluation was announced. Why then did we have to wait till January for the announcement of cuts in government spending, and until March for the next instalment in the budget? It could, of course, be argued that a time lag is unobjectionable, because it will take a little time before the benefits of devaluation are felt.

Until the export trade begins to boom, there is no need for measures to restrain demand. There is a measure of truth in this argument. On the other hand, there is the fact that many of the cuts in government expenditure themselves will take time to bear fruit. The government is not going to make a sudden reduction, for example, in its road building programme. Projects that have started will continue. Those projects due to start some little time ahead may be delayed. It will therefore be quite a time before government spending really starts to fall, and therefore all the more important that appropriate measures be taken in good time. Meanwhile, there is the danger that faced with the prospect of a tough budget, people will indulge in a spending spree. Particularly if they anticipate an increase in purchase tax or more hire purchase restrictions they will buy now and add to any inflationary pressures.

It is important in judging the cuts which the government have announced in its own spending to see how big a contribution they make to reducing the government's claim on men and material resources. A great deal has been made of the cuts in the social services. When we look carefully, however, we see that the government has done very little in this field to reduce the claims it is making on our scarce resources. For the most part, its so-called cuts in this field are no more than devices to extract more money from the taxpayers'

pockets and so reduce ordinary consumption. What were these cuts? Prescription charges and increased dental charges under the National Health Services, an increased National Insurance contribution (including the nominal contribution to the National Health Service), the offsetting of increased family allowances for standard rate taxpayers (although this had been foreshadowed when the plan to increase the allowances was first mentioned), and a slowing down of council house building. Thus all of these changes, with the exception of the last, merely amount to additional taxation. The slowing down of council building programmes is the only cut which actually involves the government in employing fewer men, less capital equipment, raw materials and other scarce resources.

There were also proposals to cut road building and in defence. The road cuts will, again, reduce the pressure on the civil engineering industry and may help to free men for other employments. Even this result will be somewhat indirect. It is difficult, for example to envisage some of the unskilled workers from the construction industry finding jobs on the production line in factories producing cars or refrigerators for export.

Guns or Butter ?

If the prescription charges have been unpopular with the Labour Party's own left wing, the defence cuts have been bitterly opposed by the Conservative opposition. As an economist, I do not intend to discuss the rights or wrongs of defence policy as such. Readers must look for guidance on the defence issues to experts in other fields. As an economist, however, I can try to put the defence cuts into some kind of perspective — to see how they fit into our present economic problem. First, all economists know that we cannot have guns and butter. If we use our resources to produce guns we must sacrifice butter. If we want to continue to accept defence commitments on the scale we have done in the past, we must be prepared to accept the cost—a considerable tightening of our belts. We simply cannot accept massive defence commitments unless we are ready to

shoulder the burden by accepting the necessary sacrifices in our standard of living.

There is, however, a further point to bear in mind. We must distinguish between the effect of spending money in this country on defence and maintaining forces overseas. We can always increase our spending at home on defence if we are prepared to tighten our belts. If it is a case of maintaining overseas forces, the matter is not nearly so simple. If we have armies abroad, we have to spend money in foreign countries on feeding and equipping them, employing local civilian personnel and so on. All this expenditure has exactly the same effect on our balance of payments as if we had spent this money on buying imports. There has been a deficit on our balance of visible trade since before the first war. For a very long time, the value of goods we have exported has fallen short of the value of those we have imported. On the other hand, we have generally had a big surplus on our invisible trade. This consists of the trade in services (insurance, banking, shipping and so on), tourist expenditures, and income on overseas investments. The net surplus on invisible account has usually been more than enough to offset the visible deficit. At least, this has generally been true if we think of the private sector only. Once we add the government's massive overseas spending, especially on defence, we find that the overall balance of payments may in bad years be in deficit.* It could, therefore, be argued that to a large extent the deficit is the result of government overseas defence spending, and that cuts in this sphere should be given the highest priority.

If it is thought that massive cuts in overseas defence spending will increase our ability to give aid to underdeveloped countries, this is unfortunate. Expenditure on aid would be just as bad for our balance of payments as defence spending. Nor would it be particularly more helpful to the recipient. A country like Malaysia needs (apart from specific help in

* In addition, a substantial part of the deficit in some years has been on capital account. This means that the deficit has not really been brought about by living beyond our means. We have simply spent a lot of money acquiring assets which, if it came to the push, we could re-sell, and which, if we avoid this, will yield us a future flow of income.

defending itself) to be able to earn foreign exchange in order to buy the goods it needs from the more advanced countries. It does not greatly matter whether it gets that money by exporting its own products to the advanced countries, through aid intended to promote development, or in payment for services provided for foreign troops stationed within its territories. All too often aid is required because an under-developed country has few exports that are acceptable to the advanced countries.

4 Free Health Service ?

So much, then, for the defence cuts. It is important to consider some of the implications of the social service cuts, or rather the new proposals for meeting part of the current costs. The prescription charges have been the most severely criticised of these cuts — at least from the Labour Party's own left wing. Whilst the majority of Labour M.P.'s have accepted them as a necessity, and subject to the exemption of the young, the retired and the chronic sick, the left wing of the party has seen the charges as an attack on the fundamental principle of a free health service. In other quarters, however, there has been a welcome for the charges, on the ground that people ought to be prepared to pay more towards their own welfare and that in general they are quite willing to do so.

On the whole, the prescription and dental charges will not cause much hardship. There may, however, be some difficulties. The exemption of the chronic sick, for example, will create problems of definition. It is not easy to say at what point a person becomes a chronic invalid. There will be many instances of people suffering a period of prolonged illness though in normal medical terms it would be acute rather than chronic. In the past, people on low incomes have been able to reclaim the prescription charges from the Ministry of Social Security. This arrangement, however, is not a happy one. When dealing with people whose incomes are so low that they have barely enough to meet the ordinary necessities of life, the need to obtain two or three items on a prescription could add disastrously to the demands on the

family purse. It is no consolation that you can reclaim the money when you have not got it to pay for the prescription in the first place.

The idea of a free health service is not without attractions. The taxes of the general body of healthy taxpayers provide the funds needed to meet the needs of the sick for medical care. Is this so very different from the ordinary principles of insurance? A large number of people pay premiums to an insurance company in order to finance the re-building of houses for those who have had a fire. Nobody suggests that those who have adequate resources should be asked to make a contribution to the cost of re-building after a fire. Why then should the health service be treated differently?

I think there are two points of difference. The first is that a fire in the house is bound to be source of danger, hardship and possibly of financial loss of a kind that cannot be covered by insurance. There is little reason to suppose that the existence of insurance will alter the risks of fire occurring. The risk is quite independent of the existence of insurance. The risk of illness may be independent of the existence of insurance or a free health service but the demand for medical care may not be similarly independent. The introduction of insurance or a free service may not increase sickness but it may lead to more sick people demanding treatment. One reason why many people have advocated the introduction of prescription charges or charges for visits to or by the family doctor is to prevent unreasonable demands being made on an already overworked profession. A system of charges which achieved this end would be very desirable. The difficulty is that if the charge is high enough to act as a deterrent against unreasonable demands for the great majority of people, there are bound to be some people for whom such a charge may deter when a doctor's services are essential.

The second point I want to make is that a free state service is not quite the same thing as ordinary insurance. Apart from any element of re-distribution (making some people pay more than others for the same service), the money comes from the general fund of taxation. This means that

the taxpayer cannot identify a payment that he makes in order to have medical care; nor can the government identify the money it receives in order to provide medical care. The money comes out of a general fund, and the provision of medical care has to compete with other proposals that are being put forward by other ministries when the government's pending programme is being drawn up. It is easy to see, therefore, that expenditure on medical care may be curtailed, or the rate of increase slowed down, at times when the government is running into difficulties.

It is true that the insurance schemes at present available impose some charges on the insured person if he visits his doctor as a private patient, or requires drugs. There is, however, a limit to what he may have to pay and he knows this in advance. The trouble with charges under a once free state service is that one does not know when they are going to change, what new kind of charge may be introduced, and so on. It might be possible to insure at a reasonable cost against the cost of hospital treatment. Whilst one has completely free treatment, there is no need to insure. Moreover, a man may feel that he is entitled to such treatment since he has paid his taxes while fit for many years. But if the government suddenly decides that it must charge at least something for inpatient treatment, if only a contribution towards the cost of a patient's board, the person who falls sick has to pay up. He may be called upon to pay at a time when his own income is greatly reduced and when extra burdens are placed on the family purse anyway. (The saving on keeping himself at home will in fact be trivial beside the much higher cost of keeping a person in hospital. The economies of bulk purchase of food by large institutions are more than offset by waste and by the fact that highly paid staff have to be employed.)

It is quite wrong to start introducing charges for the National Health Service. The recent proposals are not too serious a matter, but no further changes should be made in this direction. We should keep as much of the free service, even abolishing the present charges if possible, *until such time as we are in a position to think about dismantling it altogether.*

Family Allowances

There will be little complaint that, in the present economic situation, the increases in family allowances that are to come into force in April will benefit only the lower income recipients, and that the income tax child allowance will be adjusted so as to take back the 7s. a week increase from the taxpayer who is on the standard rate. The Chancellor has, however, rather implied that in the tax year 1969/70, this process might be carried further and used to limit even the present allowances to those who really need them. This would be another matter entirely. We cannot accept completely the idea that reliefs from taxation are in the same category as hand-outs from the government, and that the government is over-generous in its help to families in the higher income ranges. Before the present family allowances are withdrawn from wealthier members of society, there is a case for a very careful survey of the existing burden of taxation on families. If this new proposal of the Chancellor's were taken far, I think we would find that the burden of taxation on the family was quite excessive. At the moment, a man earning £1,800 a year, married with no children, pays in income tax £403, and is left with £1,397 to spend. A man with three children and the same earnings receives £47 in family allowances but pays £229 in income tax. He has, therefore, a net income of £1,618 to spend. The three child family is better off than the childless couple by £221; its income is 15 per cent greater than that of the childless couple. The amount of income that is left to the three child family in excess of that of a childless couple, as the results of the government's generosity with family allowances and taking account of ability to pay income tax is just about the minimum sum that the Ministry of Social Security regards as necessary for the support of the three children. The government needs to think again before it goes far along the path it has suggested.

In these days how are we to know the true guides from the false among the theologians? What is the place and necessity of religion in the Welfare State? What is the difference between the so-called "Church triumphant" and pagan mythologies?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Theologians are the usual guides to revealed truth for the faithful. How, in these days, are the faithful to know true guides from false?

The one guide to revealed truth for the faithful is the teaching Church. All the theologians in the world have no commission to teach revealed truth with divine authority. That belongs entirely to the Pope and the bishops, the successors of the Apostles to whom the commission was first given by Christ. Theologians and all other teachers of religion in the Church are under the control of the hierarchy, and they are obliged in conscience to accept its authoritative guidance.

That is the guidance which the faithful generally should depend on; and in so doing they will save themselves distress in these days of widespread interest in questions of doctrine, with its concomitant spate of publications, some of them deficient in truth, and many of them irresponsible. The essential direction pointed out by the teaching Church can be easily seen in a collection of documents in which Christian doctrine has been formulated by the *magisterium*. It is *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* edited by Karl Rahner, S.J. and published by the Mercier Press at 30/-. A good index enables the student to find at once what the Church, over the centuries, has taught about, for example, angels and

transubstantiation. Use of the book will give the faithful a deeper sense of tradition. Insights into revelation, made possible by the Holy Spirit and guaranteed as authentic by the Church, have built up a body of doctrine which is exactly true as it stands and which is a living *truth* capable of development by prayer and study in union with the Holy Spirit.

As theologians in the Church are under her teaching authority a sound definition of theologian must be partly in terms of conformity with the *magisterium* and with tradition. Writers on theology who do not come under that definition are not guides to truth.

What is the place and necessity of religious in a Welfare State?

Necessity, first. The Church can't do without the religious orders. They are not part of the essential constitution of the Church, as are Pope and bishops; but they are a response which has always been made, and which one can expect in the future, to Christ's invitation called "the evangelical counsels". The recent general awareness that the laity are called to Christian perfection has led here and there to the assertion that religious life, which used to be called "the state of perfection", is finished; but you have only to look at the documents of the Second Vatican Council to see that it is permanent.

Need, in a welfare state? There, or anywhere else, there is need of witnesses to the one thing necessary — faith in Christ, and progress with Him to the kingdom of God. More than ever before, in a world whose values are temporal, noble though they may be, there must be people who give the dimension of eternity to truth and love.

If there were a welfare state which performed, in its secular way, all the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, it would be a monster, a gross denial of the principle of subsidiarity. Religious orders, in such a state, would have to be the faithful allies of parents and others fighting for their

independence. In a welfare state of reasonable proportions, religious have their part to play in education, in their own schools or those of the state systems, and in welfare work of all kinds. They are highly valued as collaborators, even when they are disliked as Christians, except by states which are professedly atheistic. Even Napoleon had a scheme for the education of girls in France by a single religious order; and he subsidized the Sisters of Charity. If the worst came to the worst, religious orders could become an underground movement — they have done it before.

What is the difference between the so-called “Church triumphant” and pagan mythologies?

The chief difference is that the one is part of revealed, the other of natural, religion. In consequence, the doctrine of the Church triumphant is wholly true, and it has the depth and dignity of truth; but mythologies, though they are based on truths discoverable by reason, are usually vitiated by the weakness of human nature left to itself.

The first and essential difference results in others. The Church triumphant worships the one infinite God and the Trinity of divine Persons. The mythologies usually have one supreme spirit, but they also have numerous other gods, largely independent, and sometimes in conflict amongst themselves and with the principal god. Awareness of human immortality, and of a world of spirits, is a good, sound, human property. In Christianity it is kept healthy by the Holy Spirit through the teaching Church; in non-Christian religions it tends to over-populate outer space or the upper air with a disorderly mob of irresponsible spirits, good and bad.

The subject calls for a warning or two. The first is that we should not be taken in by the argument that the likenesses to Christianity in pagan religions prove that Christianity is as mythical as they are. The second is that enough harm has been done already in missionary countries by throwing out the whole natural religion of the inhabitants because it includes myths. Some natural religions are of a remarkable

purity; and they are part of racial or tribal culture. They are a stock from which errors can be pruned and on which revealed religion can be grafted. The third warning is that Christians are not immune from superstition, and they can, even in these supposedly enlightened days, corrupt their belief in the Church triumphant by making mythologies of their own.

In the one Christian Church which ecumenism is working for, how will authority be divided amongst the partners ?

The one Christian Church for which ecumenism can confidently work will exist in heaven, and all authority in it will be exercised directly by Christ who will then have no need of vicars.

Your notion of ecumenism seems to be very different from mine. Supposing — and what an extravagant supposition it is ! — that all the heads of the different Christian churches were to agree on the essentials of Christian doctrine and were to make an amicable settlement of the degree of self-government each partner in the union should have under one head, there would at once be a whole crop of successions and schisms, and we should be back where we started.

It is fantastically naive to think that there is a Protestantism that corresponds to Catholicism in uniformity of doctrine. Catholic doctrine is one because Catholics have always accepted the teaching of the Church as the teaching of Christ, binding in conscience. Protestantism is a protest against authority other than that of the Bible; the Protestant doctrine is based on private judgment. How many varieties are there of Lutheranism and Calvinism ? Nobody knows, not even the Lutherans and Calvinists. Of Protestants it is true to say: *Quot homines, tot sententiae* — every man to his opinion. Union of Catholics with Protestants would be union of the united with the disunited — which adds up to disunion.

The principle of ecumenism I take to be the acceptance of all men as saved by Christ, and charity towards them

which will help them in making salvation effective. It includes an attempt to know what is shared, of belief in God and in Christ, and what makes union impossible. It should clarify and strengthen consciences, so that one part of the agreement it promotes will be agreement to differ.

Canonization is meant to give Christians examples that they may imitate. Does not the de-canonization of "St. Philomena" make nonsense of the whole idea?

It would, if someone called Philomena had been declared a saint after the most painstaking examination of her life and writings, and she had then been demoted because of unanswerable evidence of life-time depravity. The "St. Philomena" of your question was never officially canonized, and she cannot, therefore, have been de-canonized; and her strange case leaves the doctrine of canonization unweakened.

Her history started with a gift of bodily remains (relics) taken from the Roman catacombs. They seemed to be the occasion of miraculous happenings, which were attributed to the intervention of "Philomena", the name on the stone which had covered the relics; and that Philomena was popularly taken to be a saint and a martyr. A widespread devotion, shared by the Curé of Ars, grew up to "St. Philomena", and many girls were called after her. Then archaeologists made known the awkward facts that the relics could not be those of a martyr, because they were taken from an area in the catacombs used only during a period when there were no persecutions and no martyrs, and that the Greek word translated as a personal name was more likely to be a common noun of endearment, better translated as "darling".

The relics are those of a person who does well by her clients and who answers to the name of Philomena.

In any case, the Roman Martyrology has one saint called Philomena and two called Philomenus.

Is the religion of Catholics more endangered than ever in modern colleges and universities? If so, should we have Catholic institutions of higher learning?

I don't know about the "more than ever" of your question; but religious faith is under attack at present, both in and out of educational establishments, so that those beginning an independent life away from family need special help.

The help should have been started much earlier, in the fostering of a habit of prayer which is the practical expression of faith, and in training to use intelligence for an understanding of the reasonableness of faith. Strength of that kind is necessary to withstand the assaults which are made on Christianity, both as a system of beliefs and as a code of behaviour — and one need not go to college to be subject to such incursions.

The main weakness of Catholic students is their lack of a philosophy. They can have faith without being philosophers; but the reasonableness of any religion is denied by philosophies at present fashionable amongst professors and lecturers, some of whom take a delight in reducing their Catholic pupils to a shame-faced silence. That they should be silenced is to be expected; but they should know enough about the search for truth to be satisfied with their own line.

In the same way, they should know the reasonable foundation of their code of morals, the better to assess the prevalent theories of relativism, situation ethics and the like. It is doubtful if the minds of sixth-formers are mature enough to assimilate the abstractions of philosophy. Medieval universities taught them to undergraduates. The University Colleges of Ireland do the same. For university students in this country there is nothing but the voluntary courses provided by the chaplaincy of the Catholic Society.

As there is no money for an independent Catholic University, even if it were desirable, the chaplaincies should be greatly strengthened.

IV. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy

VATICAN COUNCIL II.

OBSERVER

FOR the majority of practising Catholics, the greatest changes that have resulted from the Second Vatican Council have taken place in the structure of the Mass. A few would go so far as to deplore the form of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in which they participate each Sunday. Perhaps at times we have all to remind ourselves that, from its first inception in the Upper Room on the original Maundy Thursday, the essence of this sacrifice and sacrament lies in the repetition by those who have authority, of the simple words "This is My Body: Take and eat; This is My Blood of the New Covenant. . . . : Take and drink"; and of the subsequent eating and drinking by priest and laity of the transformed bread and wine. Separated from the washing of the apostles' feet, from the warning to Judas of his betrayal and of the terrified scattering of the rest, from the lengthy discourse on love and unity and peace, those simple words coupled with the appropriate action, are alone of the essence and lie at the heart of the central Christian prayer from the day of Pentecost to the twentieth century. All the rest of that which we know as the Mass, is accidental. The prayers, the signs of the cross, the invocations to Mary and the saints, the readings from the old and new Testaments, all these in their form and manner are our own finite, human offering to make our own part more worthy and our own incorporation in the sacrificed Christ more firm. Unfortunately, being creatures of habit, we tend to identify the penumbra with the core. But even in our own individual lives, habits in word and act may need to change, especially with changing circumstances in the society in which we dwell.

So it is with the external form and the words of the Mass: the changed conditions of our times and the expansion of the Church into Asia and Africa — now no longer colonial but seeking their own cultural expression — necessitate a revision that, at least for the times, we can only hope and pray will be an improvement on the old.

We, in Britain, came late to the realisation that such changes were in the wind. While northern Europe was experimenting with, for example, the dialogue Mass and the vernacular in the administration of the sacraments, we were just beginning to read of the new ideas in the more "progressive" Catholic press. Reluctantly and only after Rome had given the clear go-ahead, the bishops eventually conceded the dialogue Mass but even then under stringent conditions. Yet even before the Council Fathers gave, by what can only be called a unanimous decision, their wholehearted support to a complete revision of the liturgy, Pius XII had shown, long ago, that there was no ultimate reason why what was familiar and traditional should not be altered. Nevertheless it was not easy in the first few weeks of the Council, to convince the majority of the bishops that drastic changes were almost a necessity. However, by the close of the first session, even the most conservative of diocesan bishops had been converted. Incidentally, we have here yet another example of the value of an Ecumenical Council. Rescripts and *Motu Proprios* from the Holy See, bishops would have obeyed "in the Lord," but they would not have been inwardly convinced of the necessity of the changes. Old views die hard. But because at the Council they were meeting their opposite numbers from every part of the world, face to face, discussing each other's problems, seeing the other's point of view and also voluntarily attending lectures by liturgical pundits, they became convinced inwardly of the need for change. Indeed they returned home, most of them, as apostles of change, not for novelty's sake, but in the cause of renewal of the faith. Pope John had insisted times without number, that they were above all *pastors*. They had now to search out and use all valid ways and means to feed and nurture and increase their flocks.

East and West

The general principles that the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy re-iterates are not new, and we are reminded that they apply and have always applied to all the rites recognised by the Holy See — Greek, Ruthenian, Armenian, Coptic, Syrian, etc. The practical norms proposed by the Constitution, however, apply only to the Roman rite. It is for the bishops of the other rites themselves to consider whether and what changes, their own services need. The very existence of these non-Roman rites, with their roots going back to the earliest days of the Church, more ancient indeed than the Roman rite itself, and with their faithful on a completely equal footing with those of the Latin rite, should be a reminder to us, that granted the essentials of the sacrifice and sacraments, the forms that constitute the rites and create the distinctions, are but the expressions of different cultures. Christ did not come to *change* cultures, but to sanctify them. Any culture in fact can “absorb” the liturgy and should be “absorbed” by it.

What is the Liturgy?

What is the meaning of this word “Liturgy”? We tend to associate it only with the external form of the Mass — the vestments, the movements at the altar and on the sanctuary, the form of words and the actions as enunciated by the rubrics. The Council gives us its own definition, but one in conformity with tradition: the Liturgy is the perpetuation of the priestly office of Jesus Christ in His Mystical Body; it is the sanctification of man through signs perceptible to the senses, and is effected in a way which is proper to each of these signs. For example, the sacrament of Baptism like all the sacraments is part of the Liturgy because it is performed in and through Christ as priest; the washing with water, performed by man as Christ’s deputy, is perceptible to the senses and is the sign — indicated by the words used — of the cleansing of man from sin and his consequent incorporation into the fellowship of Christ with all that this word implies. In the Liturgy, full public worship is offered by the Mystical Body, that is by the Head Himself and by

the members, to the Eternal Father through the Holy Spirit. And because a liturgical act is an act of Christ, of the Mystical Body, of the Church, its form and words must be sanctioned as such by the Church, that is, by those in authority in the Church; otherwise the act, no matter from what pious intention it proceeds and the words, no matter how sanctifying, remain personal and cannot be part of the Liturgy.

Hence, the priest reciting his Office in private is performing a liturgical act, for he is fulfilling a duty of prayer prescribed by the Church; but the school which assembles to say the Rosary vocally in the parish church is not performing a liturgical act. Private prayer, acts of charity and popular devotions (like the public recitation of the Rosary) may have their sources in the Liturgy, but do not constitute the Liturgy as such. Such prayer and actions are just as essential as the Liturgy for we are individual persons, owing our own personal offering to God; but the Liturgy is essential because we are members of a society, or perhaps better, are members of the Mystical Body and the Body must pray together in unison and harmony. If it does not, it disintegrates into isolated units with the danger of casting out charity and all that charity implies.

Understanding the Liturgy

But for public worship to be fully effective, the participants must have a realisation of what they are doing; nor should they remain as silent witnesses. The whole faithful, and not just the priest, themselves constitute, with priest and bishop,—the Church, the People of God. They may offer public worship *through* the priest, and he may be the lynch pin in most cases, as for example for the consecration of bread and wine and for the sacrament of penance. But he alone is not worshipping *for* them. He may be the immediate focus of the participants but only that through him each individual's participation may be bound into one and that the action being performed might be theirs also.

It is for the sake of a clearer understanding and a greater participation, that the old Latin Mass is being dropped in

avour of the vernacular and a more simplified version. The same reasoning applies to the changes in the administration of the sacraments. It can well be argued that nearly all those present at a Latin Mass know that the priest is offering anew the sacrifice of Calvary and consecrating bread and wine to be their food, but the actual external participation is negligible. We know, indeed that so often the priest is murmuring at the altar and the server numbling behind him, without much conscious recognition on their part by the congregation. Only the tinkling of the bell makes them aware of the progress of what is being done. Our reading of the English missal, trailing far behind the racy repetitions of the priest, is our only help to active participation. For the majority of us, we are present at Mass and that is enough. That "mere" presence at Sunday Mass must not be belittled, for it is no small act of worship in itself and fulfils a duty to God, but the question had to arise: Could it be bettered?

The Old and the New

To judge by the letters of protest that have poured into the offices of bishops and newspaper editors, there are those who find the old Latin Mass fully satisfying and who felt themselves to be complete participants under the former Liturgy. But unfortunately (or should it be fortunately?) the majority of us are weaker brethren — weaker in Latin, in comprehension, in imagination, in the ability to concentrate. It is for the majority that the Church has to legislate in matters of form. The new Liturgy must never be viewed as a condemnation of the old; never interpreted as a dismissal of those spiritual pillars of the Church who followed the Mass in their English missals, or who drew out their Rosaries and united themselves with the offering of Christ through His Blessed Mother. It is upon their spiritual alms that the Church has survived through periods of Enlightenment and Rationalism. But the Liturgy should and must mean participation by more than the remnant. Hence the Teaching Church has "vernacularised" and simplified precisely to help the majority who have been deterred hitherto by the wall of

Latin and the rubrical complexity.

But change will prove useless unless there accompanies it a renewed instruction for both priest and laity. Priests themselves therefore, the Council fathers insist, must be given a more solid training in the Liturgy and above all be made to see the intimate connection between the Liturgy and all their studies in dogmatic and pastoral theology. In this way, they themselves should be able to give a greater spiritual meaning to their pastoral activities and be the better able to instruct the People.

The New Regulations

The Council insists that it is not for the individual priest to introduce his own innovations. All changes must depend first on the Apostolic See, secondly on the diocesan bishop and thirdly on the territorial assemblies of the bishops. Even in the diversity there must reign order. In so far as the Sacred Scriptures are the foundation of liturgical prayers and forms, they also need greater diocesan and parochial study. Participation should include the external manifestation of unity through vocal prayer, hymn singing, a greater diversity in the choice of the lessons and gospel readings, and a homily on their meaning and application.

The Mass or Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Fathers declare, is, not only a perpetuation of the sacrifice of the Cross, but also a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, the bond of charity and the gift of grace; and finally the pledge by Christ of future glory. The faithful should if possible, culminate their participation with the reception of Christ in communion. The laity are granted the right on certain occasions to receive of the Precious Blood. Concelebration or the joint offering of Mass by more than one priest, is to be encouraged, again as a symbol of the unity in charity that should unite the priests themselves and the priests with the laity.

Also viewed as an integral part of the liturgy are the Sacraments which cannot in essence be separated from the Eucharist as their ultimate source. So far as is possible they should be associated with the celebration of Mass. New rituals are to be drawn up for them all so that they may be

more clearly understood by their recipients and by the faithful in general. The catechumenate for adult converts is to be restored; confirmation is re-affirmed as the rite of initiation into Christian adulthood; the anointing of the sick is extended to those who are not in immediate danger of death, but who are aged or seriously ill. In the sacrament of marriage, the rite may be adapted to local customs — an innovation especially valuable to Asia and Africa; and the prayer and exhortation to the bride is to be amended to cover the groom also, reminding both of their mutual and equal obligations.

With regard to the Liturgical Calendar, which is framed to honour and recall the divine mysteries as well as the sanctity of the Mother of God, of the saints and martyrs, the Council decreed that many of the saints' feasts should be confined to areas with which they are associated. There are some final notes on Sacred Music and Church Art, urging congregational singing, and, though highly commending the pipe organ, permitting other musical instruments to be played in churches; and also giving guide lines for the style of church building and interior design. Finally there is a short appendix, in which the Fathers declare that they have no objection to assigning Easter to a fixed date, provided other Christian churches give their assent and the civil authorities so wish.

The liturgical changes had begun way back in the pontificate of Pius XII, when the devastated countries of Europe were endeavouring to sort themselves out and were beginning to find new causes for burying old enmities and seeking unity. It was realised that the Europe of 1939 could never be rebuilt as it had been; nor was there any desire so to do. New ideas, new fashions, new relationships between peoples, nations, classes and separated Christian Churches had to be hammered out for Europe to rise anew out of its ashes. From that, so far as the Church was concerned, a great stimulus was given to, among other things, the liturgical movement. Pius XII planted; the Second Vatican Council has watered; we can only pray — and work — that God may give the increase.

Book Reviews

ABOUT GOD

The Problem of God by John Courtney Murray, S.J.; Wale Paperback, 9s 6d; pp. 121. **God and the Human Condition** by F. J. Sheed; Sheed & Ward Paperback, 15s; pp. 301.

A thing I find somewhat strange about contemporary theologians is the apparent assumption of many of them that the laity will read their books. I mean this in no carping spirit, but simply in illustration of the lack of contact of so many priest-writers with the ordinary lives of ordinary men and women. These are busily and tiringly engaged every day in office, factory and home. It is difficult for those of us who know something of these routines to see how those engaged on them can possibly be expected, when evening comes to close a day which would send most clerics off their heads, to go burrowing with a sigh of joy into the latest theological writing of Haring or Kung or laymen like Leslie Dewart. Some clergy and religious, no doubt, will read the new theology with interest and satisfaction, and a few of the laity will join them; but the great mass of God's people, amongst whom one must number many priests and religious, will know nothing of it, not because they are obdurate, but because they are already fully engaged. In my experience, there are few finer men around than the parish clergy of Britain. Anyone who has had the privilege of sharing their working day and observing how close they are to their people will know how limited is their time for concentrated reading and study.

It is all the more important, therefore, that what is written for relatively popular consumption should be clear and divorced from obscurity; that writing intended for heavily occupied priests, religious and laymen with an inclination for theology, should be free from private language and totally readable. The fact that so much theological writing fails

by this test today means either that many theologians cannot write, which is more than likely, or that they and their publishers do not know for whom they are writing, which is again more than possible. In either event, of course, sanctions will do their selective work. Authors who err in either or both of these respects will not have their books bought, which means that no further works of theirs will be published at popular level.

I have always wondered why so many have always identified obscurity of presentation with learning. This rather ludicrous view is given the lie it deserves by the two books under review. I have not always found Father John Courtney's writing easy going. It needs concentration, but the result is always satisfying; an eminently rewarding experience. His *Problem of God*, published a few years back as a Yale Paperback is one of the best pieces of relatively popular theological writing I have been privileged to read for a long time. And it is beautifully written, right the way through. Concentration is certainly needed to follow its arguments, but the book is totally free from obscurity, a model of first-class presentation. I would not wish it on the busy layman; but I would recommend it to the theologically-minded lay academic and to priests and teaching religious whose theological interest is strong; above all, to those who have to deal with the young and, in doing so, encounter their difficulties about God, so many of which are based on ignorance and misunderstanding. The current talk about God today in, say, humanist circles in this country is stupid in expression because riddled with false assumptions; anthropomorphic to a degree. A study of Father Courtney Murray's approach, largely and most helpfully historical but penetrating in its understanding of modern problems, will provide many, who get temporarily and understandably baffled by the unreasonableness of the modern world's approach to God, with a theological framework within which their answers to modern difficulties on this score can be hopefully set.

Everything that can be said of Father Courtney Murray's book can be said equally of Frank Sheed's. Here, again, is a book of brilliant lucidity written by one who is not only

a fine scholar, but a master of popular exposition. If only the young would learn from Sheed, particularly some of those whose rubbishy writing has tarnished the name of the London firm which bears his name, but for whose fortunes he is no longer responsible. In contrast to the arrogant obscurity of their writing, we have from the wonderful old warrior himself a model of scholarly writing in the first two volumes under the general title of *God and the Human Condition*. Volume one, which we review here, is called *God and the Human Mind*. It is unmatched for lucidity, the pages which deal with the Trinity being a magnificent example of theological exposition at its very best. I found the chapters on Scripture and Inspiration, above all that on Theology and Revelation wonderfully helpful. My endeavour in the months ahead will be to read them again and again.

But there is another thing as well. This fine book is the work of an extremely learned layman who is not only humble in face of God's truth, but helpful; or, better, who is hopeful precisely because he is humble. At a time when so many are moaning, when little men are trying to write big books about the death of God and the end of the Church, it is a most incredibly refreshing experience to pick up a great book by a fine scholar, who is master of his subject and, at the same time, possessed of a power of exposition unmatched today, in all probability, by any contemporary Catholic writer; then to read it and see the way in which, by implication and expressly, he places current dispute in true perspective, thereby bringing hope and confidence once again to minds battered and baffled by the contemporary wrangling of little men.

There are a lot of mixed-up kids in the Church today, clerical and lay. It would do them a world of good to read Sheed's book. I doubt whether most would have the humility to do so.

Paul Crane SJ